

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 4-5 remain cancelled.

Support for each amended claim is found at the originally filed claims and throughout the originally filed specification.

No new matter is believed to have been added.

Applicants thank Examiner Hanor for indicating that Claims 7-14 are allowable.

Applicants thank Examiner Hanor for the helpful and courteous discussion of July 11, 2008, wherein the following points were agreed upon:

1) The written description rejection (e.g., number iii at page 3 of the Official Action) of Claim 2 will be withdrawn because one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the Applicants were in possession of the inventive embodiment at the time of application filing;

2) That Claim 1 would be amended to remove the feature “decomposition rate of an organic group on the powder surface is less than 15%;” and doing so would obviate the written description and enablement rejections of Claim 1 as described under i and ii at Page 3 of the Official Action; and

3) The indefiniteness rejection of Claims 3 and 6-14 (e.g., i- iii at page 4 of the Official Action) would be obviated by amending Claim 11 to depend from Claim 7.

Additionally, Applicants thank Examiner Hanor for the helpful and courteous discussion of July 24, 2008, wherein further changes to place the claims in condition for allowance were discussed.

The written description and enablement rejections of Claim 1 are believed to be obviated by the amendment of Claim 1 to remove the feature “decomposition rate of an

organic group on the powder surface is less than 15%” (please see the Interview Summary for July 11, 2008 (above)). Additionally, the Office has agreed to withdraw the written description rejection of Claim 2 (please see the Interview Summary for July 11, 2008 (above)).

Withdrawal of the written description and enablement rejections of Claim 1, and the written description rejection of Claim 2, is respectfully requested.

The indefiniteness rejections of Claims 3 and 6-14 are respectfully traversed. Claims 3 and 6 have been amended to recite the term “said high dispersible hydrophobic fine silica powder.” Applicants submit the amendment of Claims 3 and 6 renders these claims definite.

Further, Claims 7-10 recite the feature “and a gas flow rate at the time of this mixing is more than 5.0 cm/sec.” Support for this feature is found, for example, at page 7, line 16 – page 8, line 9, of the originally filed specification. Applicants note this is a first type of gas flow rate and comprises the flow rate of gas (e.g., gasified organic silicon compound of the hydrophobic agent mixed with an inert gas as a carrier) introduced into the vessel by an injector and is described as “gas flow rate at the time of this mixing.”

Moreover, Claims 11-14 now recite the feature “wherein a gas flow rate in the fluidized bed type reaction vessel is more than 3.0 cm/sec at the time of the hydrophobic treatment.” Applicants submit the article “a” renders this feature definite. Support for this claim feature can be found, for example, at page 7, lines 7-14, of the originally filed specification. Applicants note this is a second type of gas flow rate comprising the flow rate of the gas in the reaction vessel and is described as the “gas flow rate in the fluidized bed type reaction vessel.”

Withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit the present application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon



Charles J. Andres, Jr., Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 57,537

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)